

cussed this question, nor had an opportunity been yet presented of debating it on its merits. And now we find a hollow proposition brought in here, and he was called upon as a delegate from Baltimore city, to express his sentiments in regard to it. Singular to say it violated the very principle it started out with. Let gentlemen adopt a principle, and show him that there was a spirit of compromise, based on some principle. Let them not stand on an odious discrimination against people who live in the city, as contrasted with those who reside in the country, and he was ready to give such a compromise his sanction. There was one great principle which he believed every man should go for; it was that the people should be represented according to numbers in the State of Maryland. And if you are afraid of their aggregate power, and want a compromise on some principle, then check it in the Senate.

He would say that according to the eternal principles of justice, the people had a right to be equally represented in the Senate as well as the House. But this would be a compromise which had a principle. The Senate could not pass any law, without the approbation of the House of Delegates, and each would hold a veto on the other. There, the power was equally divided, and there was a compromise between the two antagonist principles of territory and population. But when he was asked to abandon such a high and honorable compromise—and not even to look it in the face, but to come down by the whittling operation to the little end of nothing, in order to purchase four or five additional delegates to the great city of Baltimore, with more white population and property in it than one-third of the whole State, he would say that he spurned it as a compromise, because instead of being half a loaf, it was but a crumb. Now, there was his position, as taken originally. In order to define that original position he would read an extract from the debates in this Convention on the fifth of February last.

Here Mr. B. read his remarks of that date from the Register of Debates, showing that he had then declared that he would know no compromise on this question, and it must be passed without his vote. By no compromise, Mr. B. explained, that he meant no compromise of the principle in the House of Delegates.

Why, there were gentlemen in this Convention who recollected that before Christmas, when the gentleman from Anne Arundel, (Mr. Dorsey,) had remarked that Baltimore city could gamble voters away by twenty and thirty thousand in compromises, he, (Mr. B.,) had replied that he did not come here to gamble away human rights, as if we were at a faro bank gambling our money. He would place himself consistently with the position he had taken before Christmas, and in the debate on the fifth of February, and would fearlessly adhere to it. Now, he did not desire to make a long speech, but only to say this, that this jealousy against Baltimore city, which he had referred to in Convention, and which it was said was well founded, was in his opinion, an odious,

unjust and unreasonable jealousy, and ought not to exist as between city and country. Was it, he inquired, founded upon principle? Was it founded upon experience in the affairs of Maryland? He said it was not. Gentlemen got up and declared themselves to be reformers, while they, in many instances, opposed the principle and would debar others of their just rights. These were the men who would make odious discriminations and distinctions between Baltimore city and the rest of the State, merely because the city contained a large population. Now, was there any thing sound or rational in such an argument as that? Was not this he asked, an agricultural State? Was not Baltimore a commercial city? And was there ever any thing heard of in opposition between the two? Was not commerce the handmaid of agriculture? And was it not to the interest of both, and of all the people of the State, that these two great interests should act together in union and harmony? Certainly it was.

He would say, that there was no foundation for jealousies as between the country and the city, and he would not yield to them, so far as his vote was concerned, isolated now as this question was. What was the principle upon which the eight million bill was passed? Who advocated it? The small counties? He could show the Convention the memorials from Queen Anne's, Caroline and other counties, in behalf of that bill. Were not the contemplated improvements to connect with Baltimore city? Was there any jealousy then? And was it not found that the people, even of the Eastern shore, had been highly benefited by those improvements—therefore, they had nothing to complain of against Baltimore? That was the fact. Now, was he going to recognise those little local jealousies, because one great city and a few counties happened to *fancy* that they have rival interests? There was nothing in the argument—nothing in the exception to the admitted general rule of right and justice. If they were afraid of Baltimore—if they were afraid of her overwhelming population, why not curtail and limit the subjects of legislation. "We are," [observed Mr. B.,] "willing to co-operate with you; we have done so on every occasion." As far as he was concerned, he would give the counties a *carte blanche* to restrict and tie up the Legislature so as to prevent them from taxing the whole people of the State. He believed that they had already satisfactorily acquitted themselves in that respect. He was willing to protect the smallest counties against the largest, so that legislative oppression should not be brought to bear upon them. He was of opinion that numbers ought to have their due weight and preponderance and influence, at least, in the popular branch of the Legislature. He had very briefly submitted the grounds upon which he rested his argument, and he did not see why the bond of human rights should not be fulfilled.

Mr. B. in reply to a question from Mr. PRESSMAN, said:

If this Convention did not touch the basis of representation at all, but if it went for salutary